

Parental experiences of prenatal whole exome sequencing (WES) in cases of ultrasound diagnosed fetal structural anomaly

Quinlan-Jones, Elizabeth; Hillman, Sarah C.; Kilby, Mark D.; Greenfield, Sheila M.

DOI:
[10.1002/pd.5172](https://doi.org/10.1002/pd.5172)

License:
Other (please specify with Rights Statement)

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):
Quinlan-Jones, E, Hillman, SC, Kilby, MD & Greenfield, SM 2017, 'Parental experiences of prenatal whole exome sequencing (WES) in cases of ultrasound diagnosed fetal structural anomaly', *Prenatal Diagnosis*, vol. 37, no. 12, pp. 1225-1231. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pd.5172>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Quinlan-Jones E, Hillman SC, Kilby MD, Greenfield SM. Parental experiences of prenatal whole exome sequencing (WES) in cases of ultrasound diagnosed fetal structural anomaly. *Prenatal Diagnosis*. 2017;37:1225–1231. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pd.5172>, which has been published in final form at 10.1002/pd.5172. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving.

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

Parental Experiences of Prenatal Whole Exome Sequencing (WES) in Cases of
Ultrasound Diagnosed Fetal Structural Anomaly

**Elizabeth Quinlan-Jones¹, Sarah C. Hillman², Mark D. Kilby^{1,3,4} and Sheila M.
Greenfield⁵**

¹Fetal Medicine Centre, Birmingham Women's and Children's NHS Foundation
Trust, Mindelsohn Way, Edgbaston, Birmingham, B15 2TG, UK

²Unit of Primary Care, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, CV4 7AL

³Birmingham Centre for Women's and New-born Health, College of Medical and
Dental Sciences, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham, B15 2TT, UK

⁴Institute of Metabolism and Systems Research, College of Medical and Dental
Sciences, University of Birmingham, B15 2TT, UK

⁵Institute of Applied Health Research, College of Medical and Dental Sciences,
University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham, B15 2TT, UK

**Running title: Parental experiences of whole exome sequencing (WES) for
prenatal diagnosis**

Manuscript word count: 3763

Corresponding author: Elizabeth Quinlan-Jones, Fetal Medicine Centre, Birmingham
Women's and Children's NHS Foundation Trust, Mindelsohn Way, Edgbaston,
Birmingham, B15 2TG, UK, Telephone: 0121 472 1377, Email: Elizabeth.quinlan-
jones@bwnft.nhs.uk

Funding

This publication is part of the PAGE Study and presents independent research commissioned by the Health Innovation Challenge Fund (HICF – R7-396), a parallel funding partnership between the Department of Health and Wellcome Trust. The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the Department of Health or Wellcome Trust.

Conflict of interest

The authors are unaware of any potential conflict of interest.

What is already known about this topic?

- Prenatal WES for genetic diagnosis is possible, but little is known regarding parental experiences of prenatal sequencing

What does this study add?

- Parents require specific information to help them decide whether to undergo WES for prenatal diagnosis
- Appropriate counselling is essential for informed consent
- Parents require explanation about what WES might identify, and how and when findings are returned

Abstract

Objective

To explore parental experiences of WES for prenatal diagnosis, and ascertain what influenced their decision-making to undergo testing.

Method

Twelve women comprised a purposeful sample in a series of semi-structured interviews. All had received a fetal anomaly diagnosis on ultrasound. A topic guide was used, and transcripts were thematically analysed to elicit key themes.

Results

Five main themes (parental experiences of prenatal WES, need for information, consent/reasons for prenatal WES, sources of support for prenatal WES, and return of WES findings to families) emerged, some with multiple sub-themes.

Conclusions

Parents desired as much information as possible and appreciated information being repeated, and provided in various formats. Many struggled with clinical uncertainty relating to the cause and prognosis following a fetal anomaly diagnosis, and found it difficult to balance the risks of invasive testing against their need for more definitive information. Parents trusted their clinicians and valued their support with decisions in pregnancy. Testing was sometimes pursued to reassure parents that their baby was 'normal' rather than to confirm an underlying genetic problem. Parents were motivated to undergo WES for personal and altruistic reasons but disliked waiting times for results, and were uncertain about what findings might be returned.

Key words: Prenatal; whole exome sequencing; parents views

Introduction

Structural anomalies are diagnosed by ultrasound in up to 3% of pregnancies^[1]. Fetal outcome is variable depending on the type of abnormalities identified, and the underlying genetic aetiology^[2]. Determining the potential cause of fetal anomalies enables a more accurate diagnosis and provides prognostic information relating to

the pregnancy and the likely risk of recurrence^[2]. Genetic testing is available for parents following the identification of a fetal anomaly and recent advances in molecular genetics are enabling increasingly detailed prenatal genetic investigation^[3]. Prenatal genetic diagnosis is of significant value to parents and can assist with prospective planning for optimal perinatal management^[4]. It may also provide a means to inform parental decisions regarding the continuation or termination of an affected pregnancy. **Currently in the UK prenatal genetic testing involves increasingly routine QF-PCR (Quantitative Fluorescence-Polymerase Chain Reaction) and CMA (Chromosomal Microarray) to identify chromosomal differences and variations in copy number (CNVs). Targeted genetic sequencing of exonic regions is used to detect single nucleotide variants (SNVs) associated with various single gene disorders, but this modality has limited potential to identify CNVs. Whole genome sequencing (WGS) approaches are beginning to be used and have the ability to detect CNVs.**

Next-Generation Sequencing (NGS) and the Prenatal Application of Whole Exome Sequencing (WES) Approaches

NGS applications are broadening the scope of prenatal diagnosis to identify the genetic aetiology of sporadic and inherited disease^[5] and are revolutionising current practice in prenatal diagnostics^[6]. Sequencing analysis of trio (fetal and biparental) DNA can identify genetic alterations that are potentially causative of fetal abnormalities, but this technology is only recently being evaluated within prenatal medicine. WES captures the majority of regions that encode proteins to identify SNVs and small insertions and deletions (indels)^[5]. As a technique it has proved useful to the diagnosis of known genetic disease and to the discovery of novel

disorder genes,^[7] and is increasingly being used to diagnose rare Mendelian conditions (when standard tests are uninformative)^[8]. The use of WES in prenatal diagnosis is potentially advantageous as its accuracy enables personalised care, prospective risk assessment and preventative fertility treatment, reproductive genetic counselling and family planning^[9]. As such, if a definitive diagnosis is made this testing may aid understanding of aetiology, potential co-morbidities and risk of recurrence. However, NGS, in the prenatal setting, presents potential challenges around the interpretation of results, especially if positive results are not thought to be 'causative' or are of unknown significance. The detection of these secondary and/or incidental findings (ICFs), may have significant and morbid emotional effects on the parents and also impact negatively on parental decision making in the prenatal setting.

Several studies involving WES in patients with Mendelian disease have demonstrated a diagnostic yield in the order of 25%^[10-11]. This indicates that WES is complementary to conventional prenatal diagnostic techniques^[12]. Research relating to the use of genetic sequencing for prenatal diagnosis in on-going pregnancy is limited,^[4] however, the feasibility of WES in prenatal diagnostics has been demonstrated in small case series^[3,12,13]. Survey data involving 186 expectant parents in the USA demonstrated that 83% thought that prenatal WES should be offered,^[14] and research into the views of fifteen women with non-continuing anomalous pregnancies found that they had high hopes and expectations of WES, despite testing enabling a diagnosis in only 1 in 3 (30% of cases)^[15].

Successful implementation of WES for prenatal diagnosis would require rigorous health economic assessment, and would be dependent upon the development of

rapid analytical and interpretation pipelines^[12]. Sequencing findings would need to be available within a timeframe that would assist parents to make informed decisions relating to the affected pregnancy, and this will only be possible when the knowledge base relating to the genetic causes of prenatal structural anomalies is significantly developed^[12]. The challenge of prenatal WES will be the integration of sequencing analysis into prenatal diagnostics as part of a responsible and ethical framework for clinical practice^[2]. Currently, the PAGE consortium project funded by the Department of Health/Wellcome Trust is prospectively recruiting parent/fetus trios across the UK to investigate the prenatal use of WES as a diagnostic tool in structurally abnormal fetuses^[16]. The study will analyse ~1000 trio whole exomes with the aim to elucidate the relative contribution of different forms of genetic variation to prenatal structural anomalies.

As the use of WES increases, and transfers from the research setting to routine care, it will be important to ensure a streamlined approach to the integration of genomic analysis to existing prenatal care pathways. This transition will require an understanding of parental acceptability and expectations around sequencing analysis for prenatal diagnosis following discussion with parents who have personal experience of this type of genetic testing in pregnancy. These parents will provide a unique perspective on their experiences as it is important to ensure that this technology is translated into clinical care because parents consider it to be of value. The views of parents who have undergone genetic sequencing for prenatal diagnosis have not been formally explored using qualitative interview methodology. The aim of this research was to gain insight into the experience of parents who have undergone prenatal WES following a fetal anomaly diagnosis, to understand more about what

influenced their decision-making to have testing, and elicit their beliefs around how they perceived WES to be of potential benefit. Qualitative methods allow for exploration of parental experiences, beliefs and feelings around the use of prenatal WES in a way that quantitative methodology cannot. It is important to understand parental views around prenatal sequencing to inform the routine use of these technologies in the future.

Method

A purposeful sample^[17] (i.e. parents who had undergone WES for prenatal diagnosis following enrolment in the PAGE Study^[16]) was selected to participate in this research. All parents had received focussed pre-test counselling for approximately one hour from a fetal medicine specialist regarding standard invasive prenatal testing options (QF-PCR and CMA), non-invasive prenatal testing (NIPT) for common aneuploidy, and WES as part of the PAGE Study. All were informed prior to testing that trio analysis (biparental/fetus) would be performed and that results would not be available within the timeframe of their pregnancy. It was also explained that only pathological findings considered to have contributed to the fetal phenotype would be returned, and that no uncertain, secondary or incidental information would be reported. They were also told that WES could potentially detect up to 10% more causes for fetal structural anomalies above standard testing based on existing evidence. Fifteen women were approached at random by EQJ (research midwife) during their appointments at the Birmingham Women's Hospital Fetal Medicine Centre and asked to participate in an interview, three of whom declined without giving a reason, thus the study sample composed twelve women (Figure 1). It was anticipated that if data saturation was not reached after twelve interviews then more

interviews would continue until data saturation was achieved. Interviews were undertaken either at the hospital or at home depending on parental preference. A topic guide was used to guide questioning, and interviews were carried out by EQJ with each interview lasting approximately 30 to 45 minutes. Development of the topic guide was informed by related focus group research with stakeholders undertaken by EQJ and others^[18]. Women were interviewed alone, or with their partner/or other close family member. All women spoke English although this was not a criterion for inclusion. **The timing of interviews varied, but all were carried out within two weeks of parents giving consent for WES.** Issues explored with parents included their personal experience of prenatal genetic testing and diagnosis, and what they remembered and understood regarding WES. Parents were asked about their expectations and concerns relating to prenatal genetic sequencing, and about the factors that influenced them to undergo testing, including the information they required to inform their decision. Interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed. National Research Ethics Service approval to undertake this study was granted by West Midlands - South Birmingham Committee (REC Reference 14/WM/0150).

Analysis

Analysis of the interview data followed a standard thematic approach^[19]. Transcripts were read by EQJ to enable familiarisation. Using an inductive process^[20] the transcripts were then coded for similarities and differences in content to develop a coding frame. Encompassing key themes with underpinning sub-themes were produced by combining the identified codes. Two transcripts were independently read by SCH (clinical co-facilitator for aforementioned focus groups and interview design) who similarly used thematic analysis to elicit themes^[19]. The coding frame

developed by EQJ was shared with SCH and was subsequently modified. The coding frame and agreed themes were shared with SMG (medical sociologist). Two further transcripts were analysed by SMG using the established coding frame. Further amendments to the coding frame were not thought necessary as a result of this analysis. All three researchers met to reach a consensus that the themes identified were indeed reflective of the accounts provided. A rapid analysis of the interview transcripts was then undertaken by EQJ to ensure completeness and assess for data saturation^[19]. A consensus decision by the three researchers was made that data saturation had occurred and that no further interviews were required.

Results

Participants were diverse with regard to age, ethnicity, parity and gestation, and had varying diagnoses of both isolated and multiple fetal structural anomalies (Figure 1). Women were aged between 21 and 38, and identified themselves as Caucasian, Black African or Asian, with Caucasian women comprising 75% of the sample. Of the 12 women interviewed 7 (58%) were multiparous and gestational ages ranged from 12 to 38 weeks. There was an equal split between isolated and multiple structural abnormalities and the prognosis for fetuses were variable and sometimes uncertain.

Five main themes emerged some with multiple sub-themes (Figure 2).

Theme One: Parental experiences of prenatal WES

Parents sometimes struggled to balance the risks of invasive testing against the perceived benefit of receiving a genetic diagnosis, particularly if there was uncertainty relating to the ultrasound features and the prognosis for the baby (this

209 was especially true if there was a previous history of miscarriage and any associated
210 traumatic memories)

211 *“It was more the risk factor because I had a miscarriage last year and it was*
212 *really horrible so we didn’t want to go through that again, especially as I was*
213 *well over 20 weeks and into my second trimester and the baby was fully*
214 *formed, so that was quite worrying but it wasn’t so much for the results”*

215 *(Interview 4 – Mother)*

216 Parents felt shocked when first told that their baby had a congenital difference, but
217 this initial shock was often replaced with on-going anxiety. Some said it felt as
218 though a ‘heavy weight’ had been placed upon them, and found the experience to be
219 extremely scary. Parents appeared to worry more about the uncertain prognosis for
220 the baby and less about the genetic findings that testing might identify. Many
221 remembered feeling overwhelmed by the different tests available, and felt that their
222 worries and concerns were compounded because they had so much to think about
223 at the time:

224 *“It was scary to be honest with you, all the different tests and constant worry.*
225 *It was worrying because we didn’t know what she (baby) would look like or*
226 *anything like that” (Interview 2 – Father)*

227 Self-blame that they had done something to have caused the fetal anomaly was a
228 common parental concern, thus a desire for reassurance that this was not the case
229 was reported. All parents described that they trusted their clinicians and valued
230 receiving their clear explanations. Parents described that they were assisted in their
231 decision-making when they felt supported by clinicians, and believed that any

232 prenatal testing options discussed by the consultant overseeing their care would be
 233 relevant and useful which reassured them:

234 *“We thought that it would give us some reassurance and help us plan and*
 235 *prepare for the future” (Interview 4 – Father)*

236 Some parents described how they tried to remain hopeful for a good pregnancy
 237 outcome, but also felt that they would love the baby regardless of any disability they
 238 may have. Some remembered consciously blocking out their concerns in an attempt
 239 to keep positive, believing that searching out more information would only serve to
 240 exacerbate their worry. When faced with various options, parents felt that they could
 241 make difficult decisions if they were not pressurised and were given enough time:

242 *“I think we’ve tried to blank quite a lot of it because we don’t want to be*
 243 *negative. When she is here we will cross that path won’t we?” (Interview 2 –*
 244 *Mother)*

245 **Theme Two: Need for information**

246 A desire for information to understand more about the anomaly affecting their baby
 247 and the different testing and treatment options available was universally reported by
 248 parents. Parents needed to ask lots of questions of their clinicians as they tried to
 249 balance the pros and cons of testing:

250 *“More information is all good because it helps us understand whatever it is.*
 251 *You can prepare yourself and your family and do what you possibly can with*
 252 *the information that you are given” (Interview 1 – Father)*

A need for repetition of complex information was also evident as parents found it difficult to fully understand everything that they were told at the initial consultation. Discussion and explanation on more than one occasion was found to be helpful, and parents appreciated receiving clinical details in written format relating to the specific anomalies identified:

“Some things you don’t understand, some of the things the doctor says”

(Interview 2 – Mother)

“But when they break it down into smaller (pieces), all these big words like, and obviously we don’t know what they mean, but they do break it down”

(Interview 2 – Father)

Theme Three: Consent and reasons for prenatal WES

Desiring more information and a wish to rule out as much as possible was a key motivator for parents to undergo prenatal testing. Parents perceived WES as a more detailed assessment to find out additional genetic causes for the anomalies affecting their baby that are not tested for routinely. They considered more information to be the best thing for parents and the baby and this was often the main reason for testing:

“It was going to test for more than everything else, and if there was anything rare that it is more likely to pick that up, and he explained that it will take much longer” (Interview 10 – Mother)

Parents were aware that testing involved looking for differences and similarities between their individual DNA and the DNA of their baby. It was understood that the testing would not benefit the current pregnancy (because results would not be

276 reported back within the timeframe of pregnancy), but thought that it may be helpful
277 for the baby when older, or if it could provide information for future pregnancy
278 planning:

279 *"It was to try and work out if there is anything between us (parents) that has*
280 *caused the anomalies. I do not know whether it searches for one or both or*
281 *whatever, but just that it is trying to find out if there is anything that is within*
282 *either of us that has made these things happen in the baby" (Interview 3 –*
283 *Mother)*

284 Parents were sometimes uncertain about what was actually being tested for or ruled
285 out and would have appreciated hearing about some example conditions. Most felt
286 that it was better to know about any genetic causes and hoped that the testing would
287 provide answers which would be reported back to them:

288 *"I would like to know about what other things they test for because I asked*
289 *them and they said they would test for over 200 things but I would have liked*
290 *examples because that was still worrying me" (Interview 5 – Mother)*

291 Parents described their decision to have prenatal WES as an opportunity to help
292 others in the future. Altruistic motivations involved feeling that it was important to
293 gather more information on the genetic causes of fetal anomalies, and viewed their
294 participation as a means to contribute to research and the progression of medical
295 knowledge:

296 *"I was kind of contributing to something really, to help others in the future. It is*
297 *the only way you are going to learn and evolve in the medical field. If you can*

298 *achieve anything with it then I would be more than happy” (Interview 7 –*
 299 *Mother)*

300 **Theme Four: Sources of support for prenatal WES**

301 Electronic and written sources of support were helpful to parents when faced with the
 302 decision of whether to undergo prenatal sequencing. Many opted to avoid the
 303 internet due to a perceived risk of inaccurate information. Parents felt that some
 304 internet sources showed the extremes of disease and were not always relevant.
 305 Some accessed NHS websites and Wikipedia feeling that these were more
 306 trustworthy sources. Information leaflets on specific conditions were generally found
 307 to be helpful:

308 *“We got advice before we came here as well to steer clear of the internet*
 309 *because obviously you get a lot of misinformation, so I kind of took that to*
 310 *heart as it sounded quite sensible so I have not really been googling”*
 311 *(Interview 1 – Father)*

312 Interactive sources of support were reported to be helpful and parents valued being
 313 able to ask questions directly. One couple described that they would have liked to
 314 speak to other parents with similar experiences, suggesting that a workshop where
 315 they could find out more information and ask questions could be a forum for this:

316 *“Maybe a workshop held by the hospital or midwife that is solely dedicated to*
 317 *this as part of their job, where they would have all the knowledge and can*
 318 *educate families, and where parents can come together and share their*
 319 *experiences” (Interview 4 – Father)*

320 **Theme Five: Return of prenatal WES findings to families**

321 Presently, the prenatal WES ‘clinical pipeline’ within the PAGE Study^[16] takes up to
 322 twelve months. The delay in receiving results was felt by some parents to have
 323 prolonged their worry and anxiety. Parents still wished to have WES even though
 324 they knew that there would be a significant wait for results believing that they would
 325 still rather know than not know about any relevant genetic findings. Many described
 326 that having this information eventually would help their understanding and better
 327 equip them to cope and prepare for any challenges ahead. Some felt that more
 328 information in time relating to the risk of recurrence was worth waiting for and would
 329 possibly assist them with future pregnancy planning:

330 *“That was what I hated, just waiting (for results)” (Interview 5 – Mother)*

331 Some parents were uncertain regarding the process by which results would be
 332 returned and would have appreciated having this better explained to them. Some
 333 parents preferred to return to the hospital and have the results explained by familiar
 334 clinicians face-to-face. All were happy for their information to be stored and shared
 335 with other clinicians and researchers involved in prenatal diagnosis, and although
 336 some said that they preferred their personal information to be anonymised, others
 337 were less concerned about protecting their identity:

338 *“If there was anything (genetic results) we would like to come back here*
 339 *(hospital) and sit down and discuss it face-to-face with you guys (medical*
 340 *team) because we are comfortable with you” (Interview 1 – Mother)*

341 **Conclusions**

342 This is the first qualitative interview study exploring parental experiences of WES for
 343 prenatal diagnosis. The findings are important because they are novel in this context

344 and contribute to a limited body of evidence relating to parental experiences of
345 prenatal sequencing in structurally abnormal fetuses. Given the potential for NGS
346 techniques to detect genetic alterations that are causative of various developmental
347 fetal anomalies, it is likely that prenatal sequencing will be integrated into existing
348 prenatal care pathways in the foreseeable future. Transition from the research
349 setting to the clinic will require an assessment of the acceptability of prenatal
350 sequencing for genetic diagnosis to evaluate if testing is desirable to parents. This
351 research has highlighted the views of parents who have undergone WES for prenatal
352 diagnosis, and provided insight in to their decision-making to proceed with testing,
353 and what they perceived the potential benefits of WES to be. Facilitating appropriate
354 consent for testing was highlighted by parents as extremely important, who felt that
355 they needed clearer information regarding what WES might identify, and what, when
356 and how results would be returned. If WES is to be routinely available for prenatal
357 diagnosis this will require the development of national and international guidance
358 that encompass the consent procedure, as well as the option for parents to opt in or
359 out of receiving information which is not directly related to the prenatal findings (i.e.
360 the primary indication for testing) both for the unborn baby and for themselves^[13].
361 Inevitably, prenatal WES and the interpretation of results will become more rapid and
362 clinical usefulness will be significantly improved. Likewise, contribution of parental
363 views around prenatal WES will assist with streamlining the clinical use of the
364 technology for diagnostic purposes. However, CMA research indicates that variants
365 of uncertain significance (VUS) may continue, in a small number of cases, to have
366 morbid emotional consequences^[21,22]. The need for public debate around the use
367 and potential benefits, as well as the drawbacks of prenatal genetic diagnosis is

clear, to facilitate the general acceptance and integration of sequencing techniques into routine prenatal care^[23].

Limitations

It is acknowledged that the views expressed by some parents (such as the need for more information to balance risks, feelings of self-blame, and consciously blocking out concerns to remain positive), are likely to be applicable to any couple whose baby has ultrasonographically detected fetal anomalies irrespective of whether they decide to undergo prenatal testing (including WES). As such, these particular findings are not necessarily unique in this context. This research explored the experience of parents who underwent WES for prenatal diagnosis at one large UK fetal medicine centre and parents at other centres (within the UK or internationally) may have different views. The opinions of parents who declined WES are similarly not well represented. It cannot be assumed therefore that the findings are applicable to all parents; moreover they may not reflect the views of parents who decline genetic diagnosis using invasive methods. Further research that considers the opinions of parents who decline prenatal sequencing is needed. Ethical approval for the PAGE Study^[16] only permitted the return of results to families considered to be pathogenic and contributing to the prenatal phenotype, thus it was not possible to explore parental views around the return of VUS and ICFs. Parental opinions regarding the return of VUS and ICFs will be explored in a planned further phase of work.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the families who kindly participated in this research, and acknowledge the PAGE Study Collaborative Group for their support with this publication.

References

^[1] Springett A. Congenital anomaly statistics. In: Morris J. (Ed) Congenital Anomaly Statistics: England and Wales. London, British Isles Network of Congenital Anomaly Registers, 2010

^[2] Hillman SC. Williams D. Carss KJ. *et al.* Prenatal exome sequencing for fetuses with structural abnormalities: the next step. *Ultrasound in Obstetrics and Gynaecology* 2015 (45):4-9

^[3] Pangalos C. Hagrefelt B. Lilakos K. First applications of a targeted exome sequencing approach in fetuses with ultrasound abnormalities reveals an important fraction of cases with associated gene defects. *Peer Journal* 2016 4:e41955;DOI 10.7717/peerj.1955

^[4] Van den Veyver IB. Eng CM. Genome-wide sequencing for prenatal detection of fetal single-gene disorders. *Cold Spring Harbour Perspectives in Medicine* 2015 (5):a023077

^[5] Babkina N. Graham JM. New genetic testing in prenatal diagnosis. *Seminars in Fetal & Neonatal Medicine* 2014 (19):214-219

^[6] Rabbani B. Tekin M. Mahdieh N. The promise of whole exome sequencing in medical genetics. *Journal of Human Genetics* 2014;(59):5-15

- 411 [7] Sawyer SL. Hartley T. Dymment DA. *et al.* Utility of whole-exome sequencing for
412 those near the end of the diagnostic odyssey: time to address gaps in care. *Clinical*
413 *Genetics* 2016 (89):275-284
- 414 [8] Volk A. Conboy E. Wical B. *et al.* Whole-exome sequencing in the clinic: Lessons
415 from six consecutive cases from the clinician's perspective. *Molecular Syndromology*
416 2015 (6):23-31
- 417 [9] Peters DG. Svetlana A. Yatsenko MD. *et al.* Recent advances of genomic testing
418 in perinatal medicine. *Seminars in Perinatology* 2015 Feb;39(1):44-54
- 419 [10] Yang Y. Muzny DM. Reid JG. *et al.* Clinical whole-exome sequencing for the
420 diagnosis of Mendelian disorders. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2012
421 (369):1502-1511
- 422 [11] Yang Y. Muzny DM. Xia F. *et al.* Molecular findings among patients referred for
423 clinical whole-exome sequencing. *JAMA* 2014 November 12;312(18):1870-1879
- 424 [12] Carss KJ. Hillman SC. Parthiban V. *et al.* Exome sequencing improves genetic
425 diagnosis of structural fetal abnormalities revealed by ultrasound. *Human Molecular*
426 *Genetics* 2014 23(12):3269-3277
- 427 [13] Drury S. Williams H. Trump N. *et al.* Exome sequencing for prenatal diagnosis of
428 fetuses with sonographic abnormalities. *Prenatal Diagnosis* 2015 (35):1010-1017
- 429 [14] Kalynchuk EJ. Althouse A. Parker LS. *et al.* Prenatal whole-exome sequencing:
430 parental attitudes. *Prenatal Diagnosis* 2015 (35):1030-6

- 431 [15] Vora NL. Brandt A. Strande N. *et al.* Prenatal exome sequencing in anomalous
 432 fetuses: New opportunities and challenges. 2017 *Genetic Medicine in press*
- 433 [16] Prenatal Assessment of Genomes and Exomes (PAGE) Study[homepage on the
 434 internet]. Cambridge, Wellcome Trust Sanger Institute; 2017 [cited 07 Mar 2017].
 435 Available from: www.pageuk.org
- 436 [17] Patton MQ. Qualitative research and evaluation methods, 3rd Edition, Sage
 437 Publications, Thousand Oaks; 2002
- 438 [18] Quinlan-Jones E. Kilby MD. Greenfield S. *et al.* Prenatal whole exome
 439 sequencing: the views of clinicians, scientists, genetic counsellors and patient
 440 representatives. *Prenatal Diagnosis* 2016 Oct;36(10):935-941
- 441 [19] Boyatzis RE. Transforming Qualitative Information. Thematic Analysis and Code
 442 Development. London, Sage Publications; 1998
- 443 [20] Robinson A. Phenomenology. In: Cluett ER. Bluff R. editors. Principles and
 444 practice of research in midwifery. Philadelphia, Bailliere Tindall; 2000
- 445 [21] Bernhardt BA. Soucier D. Hanson K. *et al.* Women's experiences receiving
 446 abnormal prenatal chromosomal microarray testing results. *Genetic Medicine* 2013
 447 (15):139-145
- 448 [22] Hillman SC. Skelton J. Quinlan-Jones E. *et al.* 'If it helps...' The use of microarray
 449 technology in prenatal testing: patient and partners reflections. *American Journal of*
 450 *Medical Genetics A* 2013 (161A):1619-1627
- 451 [23] Vermeesch JR. Voet T. Devriendt K. Prenatal and pre-implantation genetic
 452 diagnosis. *Nature Reviews Genetics* 2016 (17):643-656